Interview Summary	Application No. O9/410,856 Examiner Art Unit John Young 3622
المركز ا	TO personnel):
(1) John Young	(3)
(2) Andre M. Gibbs	(4)
Date of Interview Jun 18, 2002	
Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applica	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes	e) 🗵 No. If yes, brief description:
Claim(s) discussed: 1	
dentification of prior art discussed:	
	neral nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, o
any other comments: It appears that Examiner did not address the limitation determine a prevailing bid " as amended in claim 1 Applicant submit a formal request for reconsideration o an update search would have to be conducted by Exam	"the bid transformation transaction to adjust a submitted bid to Amendment A, paper#12, filed 2/22/2002. Examiner suggested
any other comments: It appears that Examiner did not address the limitation determine a prevailing bid " as amended in claim 1 Applicant submit a formal request for reconsideration o an update search would have to be conducted by Exam	"the bid transformation transaction to adjust a submitted bid to Amendment A, paper#12, filed 2/22/2002. Examiner suggested of final rejection. Examiner advised Applicant's representative that
any other comments: It appears that Examiner did not address the limitation determine a prevailing bid " as amended in claim 1 Applicant submit a formal request for reconsideration of an update search would have to be conducted by Example various options to continue prosecution remained. A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the ameliowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where available, a summary thereof must be attached.) i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a summary that the paragraph above has been checked, THE FO NCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH)	"the bid transformation transaction to adjust a submitted bid to Amendment A, paper#12, filed 2/22/2002. Examiner suggested of final rejection. Examiner advised Applicant's representative that miner based on Applicant's request for reconsideration and th
Any other comments: It appears that Examiner did not address the limitation determine a prevailing bid " as amended in claim 1 Applicant submit a formal request for reconsideration of an update search would have to be conducted by Examinations options to continue prosecution remained. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amallowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where available, a summary thereof must be attached.) i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a summary the summary that the provide a summary that the paragraph above has been checked, THE FO NCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH	Amendment A, paper#12, filed 2/22/2002. Examiner suggested of final rejection. Examiner advised Applicant's representative that miner based on Applicant's request for reconsideration and that miner based on Applicant's request for reconsideration and that mendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked DRMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has